



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/776,094	02/10/2004	Stephen Ritland	53693-10100	2357

23337 7590 07/13/2009  
HOLME ROBERTS & OWEN LLP  
1700 LINCOLN STREET, SUITE 4100  
DENVER, CO 80203

EXAMINER
----------

PHILOGENE, PEDRO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3733

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

07/13/2009

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTO\_Mail@hro.com

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/776,094	<b>Applicant(s)</b> RITLAND, STEPHEN	
	<b>Examiner</b> Pedro Philogene	<b>Art Unit</b> 3733	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Pedro Philogene. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Scott Bolecki. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 08 July 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic    b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant    2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes    e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 32 and 38.

Identification of prior art discussed: Taylor et al (6,267,765).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached.    g) ☐ was not reached.    h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant stated that he would amend claim 32, line 13 to remove the word "when" and to include "the link head is completely inserted in the hollow core" to overcome Taylor et al. Applicant also stated that the reference to Taylor et al did not teach "an attachment device includes a tension link slot" as claimed in claim 38. The examiner agrees with applicant.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Pedro Philogene/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3733